

Appl'n No: 10/517,515
Amd't dated September 15, 2006
Reply to Office action dated June 15, 2006

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figures 6 and 7. This sheet, replaces the original sheet including Figures 6 and 7. In Figures 6 and 7, corrections have been made to include the latches 124, 129 and strikers 117, 127 as described in the detailed description of the invention.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet (Figures 6 and 7)

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 3, and 6-9 remain in the application. Claims 4, 5, 10 and 11 have been cancelled.

First, the specification has been amended to properly reference the prior application no. 60/387,451 to which Applicant claims priority.

Second, the drawings stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include reference signs 117 and 129 as mentioned in the description. In response, Applicant has submitted replacement sheet of Figures 6 and 7 showing the striker 117 and latch 129 as mentioned in the description. No new matter has been added.

The drawings also stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show latch 124 as described in the specification. In response, Applicant has amended Figures 5 and 6 to properly show latch 124 as described in the specification.

The drawings also stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because the latch, pwal and detent in claims 4 and 10 are not shown. In response, Applicant has cancelled claims 4 and 10.

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 6, and 8 to provide proper antecedent basis for the terms noted by the Examiner. Additionally, claims 4, 5, and 10 have been cancelled.

Finally, claims 8-9 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Bretzner. However, the Examiner has indicated that claims 1-7 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112. Also, the Examiner has indicated that claims 10 and 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, Applicant has amended claims 1-3, 6 and 7 to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112. Claims 4 and 5 have been cancelled. Additionally, Applicant has amended independent claim 8 to include all of the limitations of allowable claim 11. Claim 10 has been cancelled.

Accordingly, it is believed that the application is in condition for immediate allowance and Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl'n No: 10/517,515
Amd't dated September 15, 2006
Reply to Office action dated June 15, 2006

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the response to this Office Action, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant.

Respectfully submitted,



Robin W. Asher, Reg. No. 41,590
Clark Hill PLC
500 Woodward Avenue, Suite 3500
Detroit, MI 48226-3435
(313) 965-8665

Date: 9/15/06

Attorney Docket No: 19339-099892